Remarks

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1-6, 15-20, and 30 have been amended. New 31 and 32 have been added to provide claim coverage commensurate with the scope of the invention.

The applicants wish to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for the courtesy of an interview on August 19, 2004. The following amendments are made in accordance with the discussions in the interview.

Claims 1, 7-9, 10, 13, 15, 21-23, 24, 27, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Legall et al. ("Legall") n view of Maze et al. ("Maze"). Claims 2, 3, 16, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Legall in view of Maze and further in view of Broadwin et al. ("Broadwin"). Claims 4 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Maze and further in view of Broadwin and Kusaba et al. ("Kusaba").

Claim 1 has been amended merely to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. As amended, claim 1 recites a method for <u>headend-based</u> information monitoring, delivery, and notification comprising:

registering <u>at a cable television headend</u> a <u>plurality of user requests</u> for information received from a plurality of Internet-enabled television systems connected to the cable television headend;

registering <u>at the cable television headend</u> for at least one of the requests user-specified criteria for delivery of the requested information in response to a future triggering <u>event that is separate from and in addition to locating the information</u>;

monitoring <u>at the cable television headend</u> one or more information sources for the triggering event specified in the delivery criteria;

10

locating the requested information;

automatically delivering the requested information to the requesting Internet-enabled television system in response to the delivery criteria being satisfied; and

notifying a user concerning the delivered information using the Internet-enabled television system.

Claim 15 has been amended to include similar limitations although in a system format. As amended, claim 15 recites a headend-based system for information monitoring, delivery, and notification comprising:

a user registration component within a cable television headend configured to register a plurality of user requests for information received from a plurality of Internet-enabled television systems connected to the cable television headend, wherein the user registration component is further to register for at least one of the requests user-specified criteria for delivery of the requested information in response to a future triggering event that is separate from and in addition to locating the information;

an information monitoring component within the cable television headend configured to monitor one or more information sources for the triggering event specified in the delivery criteria;

an information delivery component within the cable television headend configured to locate the requested information and automatically deliver the requested information to the requesting Internet-enabled television system in response to the delivery criteria being satisfied; and

a user notification component within the Internet-enabled television system configured to notify a user concerning the delivered information.

The cited references differ from the claimed invention in at least three material respects.

(1)   None of the cited references are based in a cable headend and perform information monitoring for a plurality of Internet-enabled television systems, delivering or pushing requested information to the appropriate client systems when certain delivery criteria are satisfied. By contrast, Legall merely discloses a search engine

11

(like Google) that provides immediate, existing results in response to a query. Legall does not "monitor" in any reasonable sense of the word.

Likewise, Maze does not disclose server-side information monitoring within a cable headend. Maze merely discloses a gopher agent for a television scheduler. The gopher agent is a client-side application within a set-top-box that periodically looks for information requested by the user, not a centralized server that pushes (delivers) requested information to multiple clients, as claimed. Maze is better characterized as a "pull" system as opposed to the "push" system of the claimed invention.

Because monitoring is performed centrally, the client systems (e.g., set-top-boxes) need not even be connected to the network while waiting for the triggering event. In fact, for requests that are less time sensitive, information may be sent to a requesting client system at night when bandwidth is more freely available and therefore less expensive.

The addition of Broadwin and Kusaba does not cure the deficiencies of Legall and Maze. Broadwin merely discloses a technique for delivering MPEG still images in response to a query. However, this is no different than Legall's search engine except for the mode of delivery. For instance, Broadwin's users do not "register" ongoing requests for information that may not yet exist with a centralized server. Likewise, Kusaba does not disclose a headend-based information monitoring system. Rather, Kusaba merely relates to a video-on-demand (VOD) video distribution system.

12

(2)   None of the cited references disclose delivery criteria including one or more triggering events that are <u>separate from and in addition to</u> locating the requested information. According to the claimed invention, criteria for <u>locating</u> information (*i.e.*, the requested information) is <u>separate and in addition to</u> criteria for <u>delivering</u> the information (*i.e.*, the delivery criteria). For instance, a user may condition delivery of information about the weather in response to a triggering event of receiving an e-mail from a particular user or even a change in a stock price. The <u>event</u> of receiving the e-mail is <u>separate from and in addition to</u> the event of locating the requested weather information.

The Examiner cites many different examples in which the event for triggering delivery of the information is no more than locating the information. For example, with respect to Maze, the Examiner refers to the delivery criteria as "topic, theme, and keyword," referring to these as "triggering events." However, these are merely criteria that are used to locate the requested information. They cannot be "<u>independent</u> of locating the information," as previously recited, or "<u>separate from and in addition to</u> locating of the information," as now required by claims 1 and 15.

New claims 31 and 32 recite that the triggering event comprises "an arrival of an e-mail message" and "an arrival of an e-mail message from a particular user," respectively. The applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose <u>a delivery-triggering event</u> of <u>receiving an e-mail message</u>. Similarly, none of the cited references disclose a delivery-triggering event of a change in a stock price, as recited in claim 29.

13

(3)   None of the cited references disclose delivery of the requested

information via a <u>private</u> MPEG-encoded channel.   Claims 2-6 and 16-20 have been

amended to recite a <u>private</u> MPEG-encoded channel, which is used to deliver rich

multimedia content, such as moving video content, to each requesting interactive

television system. In one embodiment, a private information indexing table is used to

identify which packet identifiers (PIDs) within the MPEG stream will be used for each

private channel.

By contrast, Broadwin discloses a <u>shared</u> channel for delivering MPEG stills to

a plurality of set top boxes. The shared channel interleaves the MPEG stills destined

for multiple set top boxes. Hence, although Broadwin's channel may arguably be

called "reserved," it is not <u>private</u> as required by amended claims 2-6 and 16-20.

Furthermore, Broadwin is limited to still frames, while the claimed invention may

convey moving video information using the private channel, as recited in claim 3.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that all pending

claims, *i.e.*, claims 1-32, are patentably distinct over the cited references. Early

allowance of all pending claims herein is respectfully requested.

14

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By

Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,54?

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999

15